

soul of a community, at its most sacred place. These fires bring terror and tears to communities that often have known all too much of both. And we are all diminished in spirit by the despicable doings of a hate-filled few.

Yet even from such a cowardly and vile act, great good has sprung. I note that upon the publicizing of these burnings, there has been an outpouring of support for the beleaguered congregations, both to fund the rebuilding of the churches and to assist in the apprehension of the perpetrators. Reconstruction of the churches has become a community affair, with volunteers from across the Nation.

Those who would burn a church should remember that to do so serves only to awaken a moral imperative to speak out and act against such violence. George Washington reflected the spirit of the Nation when he wrote in a letter to the congregation of Touro Synagogue of Newport, RI, that the Government of the United States "gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance." Today, 206 years later, Washington's words echo with renewed fervor across an outraged land.

THE DEATH OF LE MAI, VICE FOREIGN MINISTER OF VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to note with regret the sudden death last week of Le Mai, the Deputy Foreign Minister of Vietnam. Le Mai hosted me for dinner just 3 weeks ago when I was in Hanoi. I found him to be warm, intelligent, and above all eager to continue the process of improving relations with the United States.

Mai's death comes at a particularly difficult time in Vietnamese politics. The Communist Party is scheduled to hold a crucial party congress at the end of this month, where several important decisions regarding the near future of the country will be made. Mai would have been a strong force pushing Vietnam toward a more open economic system. He told me in Hanoi that Vietnam's biggest mistake so far was imposing a demand economy. He argued that the laws of capitalism "just are" and that Vietnam has developed much since economic reforms were started in the late 1980's. He also would have been a strong force pushing his government toward more friendly relations with the West. He recognized that his country needed political, as well as economic reforms and said he wanted closer relations with the United States in part to help his fellow countrymen better understand our system.

Le Mai was one of the principle architects of the normalization process between the United States and Vietnam and his dedication to moving that relationship further forward was evident in our discussions. He stressed the need for the United States to have an active presence in Southeast Asia, economically, politically and even militarily. He understood the lingering problems that many in both countries

have with the bilateral relationship because of the war, but argued that it was important for governments to try to forge policies to get past people's emotions. He recognized, too, the responsibility that he and other leaders in both countries had in creating those policies, telling me that "our generation fought the war, so it is our duty to solve the problems" that resulted from it.

His death is a loss to his country and to the ongoing process of improving relations between our two countries.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1997

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator JOHNSTON, I request that a member of his staff, Comdr. Paul Gonzales, a congressional fellow, be allowed floor privileges for the duration of debate on the Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for S. 1745, the Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1997. The Armed Services Committee has done an outstanding job by bringing to the full Senate a bill that responsibly addresses this country's national security needs.

Fortunately, the end of the cold war has reduced the most immediate threat of nuclear war. And while it is natural to feel relief that the struggle against Soviet expansionism has been won, it would be naive and short-sighted to conclude that real threats to our Nation's security no longer exist. The end of the cold war has uncapped a host of long-simmering regional conflicts around the globe. Combined with the proliferation of nuclear and missile technology as well as chemical and biological weapons, these limited conflicts carry the potential for far wider consequences. We must recognize that the world is still a dangerous place and that maintaining an adequate level of military preparedness must continue to be a national priority.

The fact is that funding for national defense has been on a dangerous downward track for over a decade. Funding for national defense has fallen by 41 percent in real terms since 1985. The fiscal year 1997 defense budget will be at its lowest level since the Korean war buildup began in 1950.

Even more alarming is the fact that military procurement has dropped by

71 percent over the last 10 years. The practical result is that our service men and women are forced to use aging equipment which will increasingly impair military readiness. The defense budget submitted by President Clinton for fiscal year 1997 would unwisely continue this neglect of our military hardware and would—not for the first time, I might add—postpone spending for critical weapons modernization programs into the future.

The Armed Services Committee deserves credit for crafting a responsible bill that addresses the need for modernization and provides the necessary resources. The \$12.9 billion added by the committee to the administration's defense funding request is mainly for additional procurement items including one DDG-51 destroyer, four F-16 fighter planes, six F/A-18's, and one C-17 cargo transport. Nearly 30 percent of the \$12.9 billion added by the committee is for accelerated research and development for programs such as missile defense, the new attack submarine, and a new arsenal ship armed with cruise missiles. These add-ons reflect the concerns and priorities of the military services themselves.

While upgrading and modernizing military hardware deserves a high priority, so too does ensuring that our Armed Forces personnel receive the benefits they deserve. The best military equipment in the world is of little value without the highly trained and hard-working service men and women on whom our national defense depends. I am therefore pleased that the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill authorizes a 3-percent military pay raise and a 4-percent increase in the basic allowance for quarters.

Overall, the committee proposes a reasonable level of defense spending in the coming fiscal year, one which I believe acknowledges that defense resources are not unlimited. The committee's recommendation of \$267.3 billion in defense spending for fiscal year 1997 is only \$2.1 billion above the fiscal year 1996 level in nominal terms. Adjusted for inflation, the committee's recommended defense authorization level is actually \$5.6 billion below the current level of defense spending in real terms.

Mr. President, the people of Maine support a strong national defense and they have always been ready to do their part. Maine's Bath Iron Works is one of two private U.S. shipyards that build the Arleigh Burke class destroyer for the Navy. I am pleased that the fiscal year 1997 Defense authorization bill authorizes \$3.4 billion for four destroyers in fiscal year 1997 plus \$750 million in advance procurement for one additional ship in fiscal year 1998. The advanced procurement for a fiscal year 1998 destroyer is crucial to implementing the Navy's acquisition plan of building three ships per year in each of the 4 years from fiscal year 1998 through fiscal year 2001. As a result of this orderly and efficient procurement